



COM/MBL/ALJ/MPO/smt 9/21/20

**FILED**

09/21/20  
01:18 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to  
Examine Electric Utility De-Energization  
of Power Lines in Dangerous  
Conditions.

Rulemaking 18-12-005

**ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S AND ASSIGNED ADMINISTRATIVE  
LAW JUDGE'S RULING REGARDING THE PROCEDURAL  
SCHEDULE OF THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE PHASE  
OF RULEMAKING 18-12-005**

**Summary**

This ruling requires Pacific Gas and Electric Company to provide responses to several questions and sets forth the remaining procedural schedule of the Order to Show Cause phase of Rulemaking 18-12-005.

**1. Questions for Pacific Gas and Electric Company**

We find that it is essential to the record of the instant proceeding for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to provide responses to several of the questions included in the August 24, 2020 Joint Response. Therefore, we require that PG&E serve responses to the following questions to the service list by October 5, 2020. The responses should be clear, detailed and fully responsive.

**1.1. Question 1**

What was the accurate number of de-energized customer accounts associated with the PSPS events of October – November 2019; and how many of these customers were given advance notice in a manner consistent with law? [Please note that each category of customers may be entitled to a different kind of notice by law.]

- a. Does the number of customers that PG&E maintains were given advance notice include customers whom PG&E attempted to contact but failed to reach?
- b. Were there critical facility customers that did not receive 48 hours' notice prior to a PSPS event, and if so, why?

**1.2. Question 2**

What steps, if any, did PG&E take to identify medically vulnerable customers and warn them in advance of each PSPS event?

**1.3. Question 3**

Was PG&E able to identify distribution substations that would be affected by a transmission line's de-energization and provide notifications to impacted customers? If not, why? Did PG&E test its ability to identify distribution substations that would be affected by a transmission line's de-energization prior to implementation of the October 2019?

**2. Evidentiary Hearings**

We find that with the provision of responsive answers to the questions detailed above, evidentiary hearings are not necessary, and the proceeding can move to briefing. Conversely non-responsive, non-detailed and/or evasive answers on the part of PG&E will likely necessitate evidentiary hearings and therefore a change to the schedule detailed below.

Additionally, prior to briefing, parties shall file motions to move exhibits into the record. The exhibits may include testimony, factual stipulations and data responses. To the extent possible, the motions should state whether there is any agreement within the parties to move the testimony. The schedule for the motions to move exhibits into the record and any responses is detailed below.

### 3. Procedural Schedule

The following schedule is adopted here for the Order to Show Cause phase of Rulemaking 18-12-005:

EVENT	DATE
PG&E Serves Responses to the ALJ Questions	October 5, 2020
Motions to Move Exhibits into the Record	October 13, 2020
Responses to Motions to Move Exhibits into the Record	October 20, 2020
Concurrent Opening Briefs	October 30, 2020
Concurrent Reply Briefs	November 17, 2020
Presiding Officer Decision	No Later than 60 Days after Submission
Commission Decision	No Sooner than 30 Days After POD, if No Appeal or Request for Review

**IT IS RULED** that:

1. Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall serve responses to the questions detailed above by October 5, 2020.
2. Evidentiary hearings are not needed at this time.
3. The remaining schedule of the Order to Show Cause phase of this proceeding is set forth above.

Dated September 21, 2020, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARYBEL BATJER  
Marybel Batjer  
Assigned Commissioner

/s/ MARCELO POIRIER  
Marcelo Poirier  
Administrative Law Judge